

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,401,124 to Yang et al. (“Yang”) and newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,097,718 to Bion (“Bion”)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 13, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the newly cited references Yang and Bion.

**A. Claim 1**

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 1 recites that a host of a first domain acquires a packet which includes routing information of a network configured with a plurality of domains including a first domain connected to at least one interworking unit.

The Examiner maintains that the client computers 14 of Yang disclose the claimed host, and the sub-networks disclose the claimed plurality of domains (Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 27-28). The Examiner, however, acknowledges that Yang does not specifically disclose that the client computers 14 “acquire” a packet which includes routing information of the sub-networks. Rather, the Examiner contends that the Bion reference does. In particular, based on the teachings of Bion, the Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to have a client of a first domain acquire a packet which includes routing information of a network configured with a plurality of domains (pg. 3 of Office Action). However, the Bion reference merely teaches that routing information of a neighbor network is stored on each router, and the information is updated from a neighbor router (col. 3, lines 53-65). Further, the Bion reference discloses a method of updating the routing information, but the information is only used for the

communication between routers. Bion does not disclose that the routing information is used for searching nodes, as recited in claim 1.

Applicant notes that a router is a device that establishes communication paths by actively exchanging routing information with each other, so as to establish communication only by knowing an address of a communicating party at the other end. This is performed even if each node does not know the path. On the other hand, in the present invention, routing information of specific nodes are received so as to establish communication between a network device and a specific node whose address may not be known by the network device. The information exchanged between routers is utilized to prepare routing information for efficiently searching the nodes. If a *broadcast* were simply performed, as taught in Yang, it would be necessary to list an enormous number of networks or nodes.

Further, the Yang reference discloses a network address table 24 that contains information for each peripheral device 18 (col. 2, lines 36-41). However, Yang fails to disclose how the network address table 24 is prepared, and as such, does not disclose how any routing information, if obtained, would be used and processed into information for node searching.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

**B. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 13**

Since claims 4, 5, 7 and 13 contain features that are analogous to the features recited above in claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 4, 5, 7 and 13 are patentable for at least analogous reasons as claim 1.

**C. Claims 15 and 17**

Since claims 15 and 17 are dependent upon claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Yang, Bion and newly cited U.S. Patent No. 6,052,718 to Gifford (“Gifford”)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yang, Bion and Gifford.

**A. Claims 2, 6 and 8**

Since claims 2, 6 and 8 contain features that are analogous to the features discussed above for claim 1, and Gifford fails to cure the deficient teachings of Yang and Bion, in regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 2, 6 and 8 are patentable over the cited references for at least analogous reasons as claim 1.

**B. Claim 9**

Since claim 9 is dependent upon claim 8, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Yang, Bion and U.S. Patent No. 5,926,463 to Ahearn et al. (“Ahearn”)**

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Yang, Bion and Ahearn. However, since claim 14 contains features that are analogous to the features discussed above for claim 1, and Ahearn fails to cure the deficient teachings of Yang and Bion, in regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 14 is patentable over the cited references for at least analogous reasons as claim 1.

**IV. Allowable Subject Matter**

As set forth above, the Examiner has indicated that claim 16 is allowed.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/544,544

Attorney Docket No.: Q58637

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Alison M. Tulino

Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 18, 2005